

SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

MINUTES

**Meeting of Thursday, March 17, 1994
Room BC-110, 10:00**

Present: E. Abouheif, S. Ali, E. Besso, P. Bird, T. Bui (Chair), P. Lightbown, K. Lipke, E. Loo (recording secretary), D. Markiewicz, C. Suen

Regrets: U. de Brentani, J.F. Plamondon, P. Shizgal

Absent: A. Homzy, A.B. Ibrahim, K. Thulasiraman

DOCUMENTS CONSIDERED AND DISTRIBUTED TO SENATE RESEARCH COMMITTEE

SRC-03-17-94-A	Agenda for the SRC Meeting of March 17, 1994.
SRC-01-20-94-M	Minutes for the SRC Meeting of January 20, 1994.
SRC-03-17-94-D1	Report and Recommendations on The Academic Planning and Budget Processes.
SRC-03-17-94-D2	Tri-Council Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship.
SRC-03-17-94-D3	Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

1. Approval of Agenda (SRC-03-17-94-A)

The agenda for the meeting was approved.

2. Approval of Minutes from the meetings of January 20, 1994 and February 17, 1994.

The Minutes for the January meeting was approved following amendment to page 4, section 7 b), paragraph 5 "The lists of courses offered at all the universities at the graduate level ... other university".

The Minutes for the February meeting was approved following amendment to page 4, section 7 b), paragraph 8 "Out of the \$200 M, about \$100 M are spent to support research in terms of salaries and infrastructures etc."

3. Business arising from Minutes

None.

4. Report of the Chair

Chair reported the following:

- The April 21st meeting will have to be moved to April 28 since Dr. Bui would be at a conference. He intends to invite Dr. Marc Renaud, Vice-President of CIAR and President of the Conseil Québécois de la Recherche Sociale to the next SRC meeting.
 - The Report and Recommendations of the sub-committee of SCAPP on The Academic Planning and Budget Processes was passed by Senate last Friday with two amendments:
 - 1) The amendment to Recommendation 10 is that the Finance Sub-committee of SCAPP should include 1 student.
 - 2) The amendment to Recommendation 7 is that it will not be implemented until mechanisms of the distribution for the development fund is clarified and in place.
 - The Tri-Council Policy on Integrity in Research and Scholarship was sent to all universities by Dr. Peter Morand on behalf of the Tri-Council.
- C. Suen noted that this document has been distributed to faculties and students of the Faculty of Engineering and Computer Science at the workshop of February 22nd.
- The ILO Review Committee has met a number of times, they are actually in the process of writing the first draft of the report which they plan to complete by the beginning of April.

5. Report of the Director, Office of Research Services

E. Besso, Associate Director reported the following:

- 1) The results for the NSERC International Fellowship are out, we have received 1 award out of 3 applications and this is for candidate in Mechanical Engineering. The majority of the NSERC results for this year competition have been received, the result is not complete but according to the statistics, our performance is probably better than last year.
- 2) The FRDP evaluation is still going on, the Committee has decided to send another questionnaire for information on which they will base the comparison performance of new hires of faculty prior to the FRDP and after the inception of the Faculty Research Development Programme. The FRDP Evaluation Committee intends to submit the final report to the SRC on April 28th.
- 3) The ORS has been organising two workshops: Intellectual Property which will be held on March 23rd and the second one regarding Conseil Québécois sur la Recherche Social which will be held on March 29th.
- 4) She has sent copy of the report on the compilation of Research Activity at Concordia to the Deans of each faculty with a request for their collaboration in both, verifying the data, and keeping the data up to date.

P. Bird remarked that up-dating the data is a very good idea, however, he suggested that a reminder be sent on a yearly basis.

E. Besso commented that she fully intends to send a reminder and hopes receiving a quick response.

6. Question Period

NONE

7. a) Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities (SRC-03-17-94-D3)

Chair noted that this report was discussed at the last SRC, he has made revisions to it based on the recommendations made and with consultation with Dr. C. Bertrand, Vice-Rector, Services and Chair of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Services and Facilities.

P. Bird noted that recommendation 3 relates to a special appointment "University Research Professor" and that there is a proposal for Distinguished Professorships in the Capital Campaign, he suggested that this cost should be part of the next Capital Campaign under the line item on Distinguished Professorships.

7. a) Report of the Expert Task Force on the Enhancement of University-Wide Research Support Services and Facilities (SRC-03-17-94-D3)

P. Bird remarked that the wordings in recommendation 6 needs clarification.

D. Markiewicz remarked that there should be some sort of reporting back. She suggested that the sentence "to report to Senate via the SRC" should be added to recommendation 10.

It was noted that this exercise should be carried out periodically, therefore, it was suggested that recommendation 11 should be added to the report, reconvening a committee of similar composition.

The document was provisionally approved.

7 b) Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Research Centres (SRC-01-20-94-D2)

Chair remarked that he does not plan to move forward the Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Research Centres. At the beginning of the year he decided to apply the Senate document approved in 1989 and that document has a section on periodic appraisal of research centres and there is a mechanism that asked research centres approved by Senate and Board of Governors to submit via the appropriate faculty council to SRC a 5-year report and the SRC will review and make recommendations to Senate. He has already written to seven centres, two from Psychology and five from Engineering and Computer Science. He would like to delay this document and table it early in the fall because once this document is approved by Senate, it will automatically overwrite the 1989 document.

D. Markiewicz asked if there is going to be an effort to compile a list where the people on that list agree that their centres are research centres and therefore, they are willing to be evaluated according to criteria. The reason she is raising this issue is that she hopes that we will have that kind of background information to be able to move more quickly and adequately.

Chair remarked that the compilation of research activities at Concordia by E. Besso is the first step. There are many issues, one of which is research centre versus non research centre. There should be a university-wide policy like the francophone universities which state clearly this is the definition of the research centre unless you go through the process you will not be allowed to use the word centre in any official way and then we go down to teams and groups.

7 b) Procedural Guidelines for Periodic Appraisal of Research Centres (SRC-01-20-94-D2)

D. Markiewicz noted that she would like to support the idea that we try to come up with criteria what is a research centre and that we fairly link this to what research centre can expect from the University in the way as support, otherwise people will just say why bother. As far as linking up with the unit appraisal system we have to make this part (research centres) of the appraisal system work. On the other hand there are many ways of doing that without abdicating the responsibility of Senate Research Committee in that process, ways of ensuring that the centres are fairly reviewed, ways of linking into the decision making process of the appraisal system. There has to be a hook-up with the Associate Vice-Rector, Academic (Research), all this to be in the process. It would not be wise to stand back and say that the unit appraisal will take care of it because it does not unless there are specific steps taken to make sure that the centres are properly reviewed. The unit appraisal committee are practically speaking so overwhelmed that unless they have the kind of expertise required they will not be able to do that adequately.

8. Varia

Chair reported that CICMA was created about 3 years ago, when the Centre was created only McGill and Concordia approved this centre as an inter-university centre. The Research Committee of Université Laval has recently approved CICMA and they also approved one or two new positions in mathematics and statistics at Laval be hired in the areas of CICMA.

S. Ali remarked that the group has existed for a number of years, it finally got approved by Québec to become a centre.

9. Adjournment

It was moved that the meeting be adjourned at 11:35 a.m.

file:...\\src\\minute93.94\\mar-17.094